

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document submitted January 13, 2004.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited with the *Information Disclosure Statement* filed January 13, 2004.

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

**Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claim 13, alleging that a typographical error exists in its dependency. This error was corrected by the June 21, 2004 *Preliminary Amendment*. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**Anticipation Rejection**

The Examiner has rejected: (1) claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lindae et al.* (US 4,800,467; hereinafter "*Lindae*"); and (2) claims 2, 5-9, 12-14 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lindae* in view of *Graham* (US 1,525,234; hereinafter "*Graham*"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

**Independent Claims 1 and 10**

Applicant respectfully submits that *Lindae* fails to teach or suggest:

(1) independent claim 1's recitation of "a pair of opposed additional reflectors disposed face to face with respect to each other, thereby providing double reflection of a second part of the rays of light and redirection thereof toward the reflector;" and

(2) independent claim 10's recitation of a "means for doubly reflecting a second part of rays of light, thereby redirecting the second part of the rays of light toward said means for reflecting, so as to be reflected forward with respect to said light source."

Rather, *Lindae* only discloses a single reflection of light by sphere segments 34, 35, which reflect light back towards the light source 17.

Additionally, there is no teaching or suggestion that the other applied reference, *Graham*, discloses the features missing from *Lindae*, as *Graham* is silent on any particular double reflection.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that rejected dependent claims 2-9 and 11-20 are: (1) allowable at least by virtue of their dependency; and (2) separately patentable over the applied references.

For example, Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Lindae* nor *Graham* teach or suggest dependent claim 2's recitation that "the reflective surfaces of the pair of respective additional reflectors are formed in a configuration comprising paraboloids of revolution." Specifically, neither left sphere segment 34 of *Lindae* nor concave reflector 4 of *Graham* are formed of a parabaloid of revolution.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/755,477

Attorney Docket # Q79396


**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-20.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy P. Cremen  
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 7, 2005